REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 are independent claims.

Claim 7 has been amended.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk (USP no. 6,031,815) in view of Guddat (USP no. 6,185,703). Claims 5-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk and Guddat in view of Nerlikar (USP no. 5,905,798). Claims 11-14, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk and Guddat in view of O'Connor (USP no. 5,745,568). Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk, Guddat and O'Connor and further in view of Nerlikar (USP no. 5,905,798). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk, Guddat and O'Connor in view of Tavor (USP no. 6,070,154).

Although the instant Office Action does not explicitly state the reason for issuing the Office Action, applicant assumes that the prosecution of this matter was re-opened in view of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief filed in this matter as the rejection of the independent claims is now made under 35 USC 103 rather than 35 USC 102.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk (USP no. 6,031,815) in view of Guddat (USP no. 6,185,703).

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action refers to Heemskerk for teaching

the elements recited in independent claim 1 except that Heemskerk does not explicitly teach the element of the control logic data comprising executable code, and the control means executing the control logic data and for controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed. The Office Action refers to Guddat for teaching the control logic data comprising executable code and controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed. (see OA pp; 4-5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims.

Heemskerk discloses an optical medium including a plurality of reference marks positioned within a track within the optical medium. The reference marks are offset from the center of the optical medium track such that a reading means may read both content data and reference mark data. Because the reference mark data is offset from the center of the optical medium track, the reading means is able to distinguish content data from the reference mark data. The reference mark data may include auxiliary data that is used to identify and/or authenticate the content data.

Guddat discloses a system that includes an embedded memory, which includes code or instructions that may be extracted from the memory by a processor.

Guddat discloses that the system may operate in one of two modes; a DAT mode or a "normal" mode (see col. 3, line 49-51). The mode is selected based on a value of a A#[30] signal (see col. 3, lines 60), wherein the A#[30] signal may be stored in a configuration register during a reset or may be asserted at reset by an external configuration logic. Or the A#[30] signal may be hardwired to a particular value (see col. 3, line 58-col. 4, line 6).

The system of Guddat teaches extraction of data from a memory, but the extracted data does not control the operation or mode of the processor extracting the data. Hence, Guddat fails to teach a system that operates in a mode based on the content data stored in the embedded memory.

Hence, even if the reference marks disclosed by Heemskerk were to represent control logic data in the form of executable code or instructions, the system of Guddat fails to provide any teaching or suggestion that the control logic data would be used to control the processing means (i.e., operational mode) in accordance with the execution of the control logic data, as is recited in the claims.

Rather, the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat would teach a system wherein control logic data may be extracted from the reference mark sections but the extracted control logic data would not provide control of the processing means, as is recited in the claims.

A claimed invention is prima facie obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. However, the Court in *KSR v. Teleflex* (citation omitted) has held that the teaching, suggestion and motivation test (TSM) is merely to be used as a helpful hint in determining obviousness and a bright light application of such a test is adverse to those factors for determining obviousness enumerated in *Graham v. John Deere* (i.e., the scope and content of the prior art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art and objective indicia of non-obviousness) (citation omitted).

In this case, the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat cannot render the subject matter recited in independent claim 1 obvious, as the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat fails to disclose a material element recited in the claims.

Accordingly, for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome.

With regard to the rejection of claim 7, applicant has amended this claim to

December 2009

further recite " ... data comprising executable code or instructions, which provides instruction for reading the content data from the storage medium in accordance with the code being executed." No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found in claim 1, for example.

For the amendments made to claim 7, applicant submits that for the remarks made with regard to claim 1, which are reasserted as if in full with regard to claim 7, the reason for the rejection of claim 7 has been overcome.

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 7 and, hence, each of the remaining claims is also allowable by virtue of its dependency upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 11-14, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk and Guddat in view of O'Connor (USP no. 5,745,568). In rejecting claims 11 and 17, the Office Action acknowledges that Heemskerk and Guddat fail to teach the claim element "to enable the host apparatus to establish that if installed in a compliant system and, when installed in the compliant system, to enable the processing means to feed the processed content data to an output." The Office Action refers to O'Connor for teaching this claim element.

However, as shown with reference to claim 1, the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat fails to disclose the claim element "controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed."

Hence, even if the teachings of O'Connor were incorporated into the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat, the combination of the teachings of the cited references fails to recite the element of "controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed, " recited in claims 11 and 17.

Accordingly, for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of claims 11 and 17 has been overcome.

December 2009

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claims 11 and 17 and, hence, each of the remaining claims is also allowable by virtue of its dependency upon an allowable base claim.

.

With regard to the rejection of claims 5-6 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk and Guddat in view of Nerlikar (USP no. 5,905,798), claims 15-16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk, Guddat and O'Connor and further in view of Nerlikar (USP no. 5,905,798) and claim 18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heemskerk, Guddat and O'Connor in view of Tavor (USP no. 6,070,154), applicant submits that each of these claims depends from an independent claim and none of the additionally cited references provides any teaching to correct the deficiency found to exist in the combination of Heemskerk and Guddat.

Accordingly, the aforementioned dependent claims are also not rendered obvious in view of the cited references as the combination of the references fails to disclose a material element recited in the independent claims, and consequently, the aforementioned dependent claims.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made, herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejections of the claims has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Applicant denies any statement, position or averment stated in the Office Action that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing. Any rejection and/or points of argument not addressed are moot in view of the presented arguments and no arguments are waived and none of the statements and/or assertions made in the Office Action is conceded.

December 2009

Applicant makes no statement regarding the patentability of the subject matter recited in the claims prior to this Amendment and has amended the claims solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the originally filed claims, as presented prior to this Amendment, and any additional claims in one or more continuing applications during the pendency of the instant application.

Should the Examiner believe that the disposition of any issues arising from this response may be best resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

No fees are believed necessary for the timely filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Belk, Reg. No. 33357

Date: December 15, 2009

/Carl A. Giordano/

By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,780

Mail all correspondence to:
Michael E. Belk, Esq.
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9643
Fax: (914) 332-0615

December 2009